

Re: Media Consolidation & Sinclair Broadcasting

Dear Sir/Madam:

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air portions of an anti-Kerry documentary, or perhaps the entire piece days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation. This is the same Sinclair Broadcasting Group who last April cried wolf over an attempt to "influence public opinion" by forbidding its seven ABC affiliates from airing a Nightline special devoted to the soldiers killed in Iraq.

The issues are: if Sinclair shows this anti-Kerry propaganda then (1) should it also give a free hour to pro-Kerry content selected by any authentic progressive organization, and (2) will Sinclair face at least the prospect after the fact of a review of its fulfillment of its public interest duties?

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for their own agenda (whether it be political or economic based) and less of what we need for our democracy.

Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them.

Sincerely,
James Goodfield
Boston, MA